

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,

Plaintiff,

v.

Daniel Torres,

Defendant.

Case No. CR 12-00049 CW

STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING  
TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL

APR 25 2012

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND

For the reason stated by the parties on the record on April 25, 2012, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from April 25, 2012 to May 8, 2012 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factors:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(I).
- \_\_\_\_\_ The case is so unusual or so complex, due to *[circle applicable reasons]* the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- X Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- \_\_\_\_\_ For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 4/25, 2012

STIPULATED:

Joyce Leavitt  
JOYCE LEAVITT  
Attorney for Defendant

Kandis Westmore  
HON. KANDIS WESTMORE  
United States Magistrate Judge

Maureen C. Onyeagbako  
MAUREEN C. ONYEAGBAKO  
Special Assistant United States Attorney